

Thomas B. Wait

CHRISTIAN PHILANTHROPIST.

DEVOTED TO LITERATURE AND RELIGION.

PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY, BY DANIEL K. WHITAKER, NEW-BEDFORD.

VOL. I.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1822.

No. 31.

MISCELLANY.

FOR THE PHILANTHROPIST.

"Dulce est desipere in loco."
Wisdom at proper times is well forgot.

THAT the principal business of our life is to improve as much as possible our moral and religious character, and cultivate and raise to the highest degree of perfection our intellectual powers, is almost self evident—at least it is so abundantly proved by all the circumstances of our outward being and by every internal operation of our minds, that it will not be called in question. The world around us is full of objects equally beautiful and astonishing, calculated to call forth our admiration and excite our curiosity; the vegetable and mineral kingdoms are alike replete with wonders—the growth of a plant, the opening of a flower, the brilliancy of the crystal, and the miraculous power of the magnet are all, and equally adapted to lead us into the paths of science, and to draw us away from indolence to search into the mysteries, by which we are surrounded. The incitements to mental activity and acquisitions are, however, by no means confined to the exhibitions of power and skill presented to us on the earth. “The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth his handy work”—fix your eyes upon the rising sun, when the darkness flies before him, and the morning sky is one surface of splendor; look upon the Queen of Night as she pursues her course in her brightness; watch the twinklings of the innumerable stars as they “sing together” in her train—and say if this goodly frame was not created for the theatre of intellect, to exercise our faculties, and call forth the energy of mind. Within us is a principle fitted to enjoy these displays of gracefulness and grandeur—a thirst for knowledge, a longing after wisdom, that will not be restrained, that cannot be extinguished. The most lethargic spirit does not gaze with indifference upon the scenes of loveliness which nature offers to his view, and her scenes of terror he cannot witness, if he would, without inquiring for their origin and seeking to know their cause.

But the culture of his own powers is not the whole duty of man; if we are rational and spiritual, we are also social beings—if we have reason to elevate, and intellect to improve, we have likewise friends, associates and companions whom we are to amuse and instruct. To be a scholar alone, is not the end we should propose to ourselves; it is selfish, it is criminal. Man violates the main object of his existence, he neglects the office most like divinity, of which he is capable, when he neglects to dispense the knowledge he has acquired, and thus to contribute to the exaltation and happiness of his fellow men. In order to this, he is not to read lectures to the multitude, or discourse philosophy to a party of ladies. The great secret of communicating knowledge effectually, is to unbend the rigidity of a man of books, to put off equally the awkwardness and self conceit that so easily attach themselves to the mere student, and while we descend in our expressions and our thoughts to their level, not to wound the feelings of our hearers by disrespect or superciliousness of manner; for no one will listen, even if he could gain a world of knowledge, to a person who has insulted him

by his arrogance, or offended him by his harshness. Though we are all willing enough to acknowledge to ourselves our inferiority, yet no one likes to have it observed by others; every man wishes and expects a degree of deference from those around him, and every man, from the King upon the throne to the beggar at the palace-gate, feels with equal keenness any slight upon his abilities, or any wound of his self complacency. He, then, who would advance the welfare of the community by disseminating useful learning, or add to the comfort and enjoyment of individuals by making them partakers in his acquirements, must lower himself to their standard, if possible, without their perceiving the change; must conciliate their good will by a due deference to their feelings, and adapt the subject as well as manner of his conversation to their capacity. R.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN PHILANTHROPIST.

MR. WHITAKER,

I HAVE read your paper since its first establishment, with much satisfaction; and I think so well of the plan, and the matter contained therein, especially on theological subjects, that I intend to keep all the numbers I receive, and make a book of them for my children to read after me. And, sir, as men are generally fond of assisting and helping on a work which they like, I intend occasionally, as I have leisure and opportunity, to send you some loose, scattered thoughts of my own, which you may publish, if they meet your approbation.

But I assure you, I shall not attempt to be very learned, or very deep, in the mysteries of Godliness; for I think that much learning, or an affectation of much learning, has made some persons appear to be almost mad. Nor shall I try to write in a style so elevated and sublime, that your readers will have to run to a dictionary to find out the meaning of one half of the words; for I do not consider those the best expounders of scripture who are most obscure and unintelligible. Nor do I, (who have not been educated in any school of divinity, and who shall use no weapons but those of plain common sense and the bible) expect to convince, immediately, the old, great and reverend Doctors, who differ from poor layman me, or to induce them to acknowledge that they have been in an error, and that my opinions and views are correct and orthodox; for there is, I know, among all great and learned men, even among professors of the religion of the meek and condescending Jesus, a certain pride of opinion and fond adherence and clinging to tenets, in which they have been educated, or which they have themselves formed or originated, so that it is as probable, that an old and great offender will be turned from the error of his ways, as that an old and learned divine should be brought even to doubt of the correctness of his own dear and almost worshipped creed. But I shall only hope in the simple, plain language of reason and the bible, to inform, convince and guide those who are not already absolutely fixed and riveted in their belief, in doctrinal points; who do not know that they are certainly right, and that every one else is ruinously wrong; and who are willing to examine with candour, and form their opinions from the *Bible*, and not from their minister or any other living divine, or from any book or system not given by inspiration.

But before I proceed to discuss any theological subject or doctrinal point, I wish to state some landmarks, or governing principles, which I trust will be agreed to by all.

When we consider the testimony of a witness or epistle, we should take into consideration all the witness testifies, and all that is written in the epistle, and not select that part only, which coincides with our own views or wishes, and disregard or reject the rest.

The affirmative of any subject, especially if the affirmation is declarative of any thing contrary to reason, contrary to every thing we ever saw, heard, or in any way ever knew or perceived, must always be clearly proved, beyond any reasonable doubt, otherwise the negative should be believed.

Properly to understand a writer or book, we should consider what was the meaning of words and expressions at the time when used or written, and what were the customs and manners of the people addressed, whether the manner of speaking, and style of writing, was direct and plain, according to the common meaning of words, or figurative and symbolical.

We should read and study the Bible for the purpose of forming or correcting our belief or opinions, and not first establish or take for established certain doctrines or creeds, and then search and perhaps twist the scriptures to try to prove them.

What the light of nature, reason and common sense teach, should have great weight (if not considered conclusive) with us, unless revelation clearly, directly and fully declares to the contrary.

All words, that in any passage in the Bible must be taken figuratively; therefore when any words or sentences used in any part of the scriptures cannot be received in their common and literal sense, without contradicting many other passages thereof, and violating the laws of nature and reason, such figurative meaning must be given to them, as will agree with the general, plain and clearly expressed doctrines of the gospel, with the light of nature and reason, and accord with the customs, manners, language and style of speaking and writing of the people to whom they were addressed; and the same expressions should not, in one place, be taken literally and in another figuratively, just as may suit to make out or establish any particular doctrine or creed.

I would now make some remarks and examination of the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by Calvin and some modern divines, who have come after him, but gone beyond him; I say as held by him and them, because I do not find that even the term or word (Trinity) is in any instance, used in the Bible. But I will not now enter upon this subject, because I fear I should take up too much of one paper, and because, as you have already published many excellent remarks and arguments on this subject, I do not know that you would wish to give publicity to any thing that might be expected from me. I shall therefore wait a week; and if you should suggest that you would like to see any thing I might write, on this subject* or any other, I will endeavor to furnish something, which, though it may be but a mite, will be given in charity.

A COMMON SENSE BIBLE CHRISTIAN.
*We would inform our Hon. correspondent, that we shall by no means prescribe in these matters. We beg only that he will let us hear from him often.

FROM THE UNITARIAN DEFENDANT.

SPIRIT OF ORTHODOXY,
As exhibited in the persecution of Universalists and others.

FOR some time past the doctrines of universal salvation, under different modifications, have been gaining ground in the northern section of our country. Of the truth or falsehood of these doctrines—of their influence on individual character, or public welfare, it is not our intention, as it is not to our purpose, at present to speak. They are certainly regarded with strong disapprobation by that part of the religious community denominated orthodox; and no little exertion has been and continues to be made to arrest their progress. To this we have no objection to make, so long as such exertion is made in a spirit and manner consistent with the mutual rights and duties of men and christians. So long as the march of error, real or supposed, is encountered with weapons drawn "from the armory of God"—with reason and argument only, christians may lawfully, and profitably, perhaps, "contend earnestly" for what they believe to be truth. But we are sorry to observe that, in the case before us, these weapons have not been thought, by our orthodox brethren, sufficiently sharp and efficient. Several instances have come to our knowledge, in which they have thought it expedient to employ coercive measures to restrain the aberrations of their brethren in matters of faith, and have directed against them the terrors of ecclesiastical censures, admonitions and excommunications. Now, we remark with regard to this procedure, in the first place, that it seems to us impolitic. It leads one to surmise that the cause, which needs to be propped by such measures, has some inherent weakness, of which its votaries are sensible. It was sarcastically remarked of Jupiter, we suppose by some heretic of those days, that whenever he was quite in the wrong, he was apt to have recourse to his thunder. We think the remark fully as applicable to religious sects, and ecclesiastical bodies, as to the shaker of Olympus. For ourselves, whenever we hear the distant echos of these spiritual fulminations, we instinctively conclude, that the party uttering them has been hard pushed on the field of debate. Lord Peter, if we rightly remember, found it convenient to call Dominick with his tongs just at that point in the discussion when his brethren hesitated to confess, in contradiction to their own senses, that a brown loaf was a shoulder of mutton. Truth should, we think, have more confidence in its own strength and resources—It certainly needs not such auxiliaries as Dominick, and should be cautious of employing them.

Let it be observed, that in no one of the cases which have given occasion to these remarks, was any, the smallest, objection adduced against the morals or piety of the individuals proceeded against. They were, in every instance, allowed to be persons of irreproachable life, even correct and exemplary—yet they were cut off from the privileges of christian communion, declared unworthy to associate with the followers of Jesus, because they could not believe the absolute eternity of future punishment. This was the head and front of their offending. They had adopted the opinion—which is probably held at this moment by a full moiety of the christian world—that all men will finally be restored to the favor of their common parent; and sin and misery be blotted out of the creation of God. Now this we consider an abuse of church discipline. The legitimate objects of this discipline are actions, not opinions. The latter are not subjected to the control of either the civil or ecclesiastical power. It is a gross and palpable invasion of the rights of conscience

in any body of christians, whether church, association, presbytery or convention—or by whatever name these self-constituted tribunals are, or have been, known—to attempt to control the opinions, or to judge of the faith of their fellows and peers; or to prescribe terms of communion other than those expressly laid down in the gospel. It is an assumption of authority, for which they can shew no warrant in the great charter of our rights. It is a violation of that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. Individual christians do not hold their right to communion and to the benefit and edification of gospel ordinances at the will of any body of men on earth. Jesus Christ is our supreme Governor and Legislator. He has prescribed the laws, by which his church is, in all ages, to be governed; and those who undertake to alter, extend, or modify these regulations, are usurpers of his divine prerogative, and must answer for their temerity, and injustice. For, on this subject they have no right to legislate—no discretionary power of admission, rejection or excommunication. The founder of the christian religion never gave them any. It is quite evident from the New-Testament, that a profession of faith in Jesus as the Messiah, or Son of God, was the sole condition of admission into the church prescribed by Christ or his Apostles; and it is equally clear, that immoral conduct is the only cause for which a church is justified in excluding a member from its fellowship. For his faith he is not, in any measure, accountable to them; it is an affair between God and his own conscience. Of his actions they can judge; of the operations of his mind, of the convictions of his judgment, they neither can judge, nor would be entitled to do so, if they could. Every christian, against whom rests no charge of immoral conduct, has a *scriptural right* to approach to the Lord's table, for example, in any church where he happens, on such an occasion, to be present; and if they refuse him, they do it at their peril. This position may, perhaps, seem to some persons to be a bold one; but we take it advisedly, and are prepared to defend it. Freedom, unrestrained freedom of opinion, is the birthright of man, conferred on him by him who made him in his own image, and sanctioned, and secured to him, by the whole letter and spirit of the gospel. It is too the atmosphere, in which truth and religion breathe, and live. (To be continued.)

FROM PLAIN TRUTH.

[Communicated from New-York.]

I lately conversed with an emigrant from England who had left that country in order to escape the abominable oppression of *tythes*. He was a man of integrity and property, and brought letters of dismission and recommendation from an English to a New-York Presbyterian church. I congratulated him on his escape from an oppressive hierarchy, but he assumed a grave look and did not seem to relish my remarks. "You call yourselves a free people" said he "but you pay dearly for your freedom. I have been a house-keeper twenty-four years—twenty-two of which I lived in —shire (England,) and two in New-York. I have kept an exact account of my *religious* expenses ever since I was married. When in England I paid 'scot and lot,' the King's taxes, and maintained my family decently. During my two years residence in this *untaxed* country, with all my economy, I find my estate to be rapidly decreasing. In this book I kept an exact account of all my disbursements for *religion*, commencing with Jan. 1st, 1798." He then read over a long string of items too tedious and complex for me to repeat. I found that his religious tax was carefully footed up at the end of each year. What was my astonishment on seeing that the amount of

his *religious expenses* ending December 31st, 1821, exceeded by 50 per cent. those of any previous year during his residence in England! He explained in a few words. Making due allowance for the prejudices of an Englishman, I fear there is too much truth in his remarks. He resumed, "My family consisted of two sons and four daughters. Soon after my arrival, my sons were earnestly solicited to join the "Young men's Missionary Society," and finally did join. My daughters required no solicitation, but joined with the *fashionable* part of their sex. Although the youngest is scarcely ten years old, they all joined 'Female Missionary Societies.' My wife, once a *notable* woman, joined so many societies that I cannot repeat the names of half of them. I merely know that the care of the 'poor heathen' engrosses her time for seven days in the week. My daughters divide their time between reading the *Missionary Herald*, *Don Juan*, attending evening meetings, and the dancing school. My servant maids, neither of whom can *read*, were urged to contribute their mite towards defraying the expenses of a *College education* for *pious* young men. They actually gave a crown piece each, and affixed their *mark* to a subscription paper then in circulation. I endeavored to shew them, that they could afford nothing in charity, when *Mary* interrupted me with 'them thit duzzent giv nothin for to convert the pore Hindostans is infidels.' I asked her where she learned this. 'From Parsons—who telled us as how for he knew that the pore Hindostans were starving for nolitch and worshipped Sigernot. I sposse as how the Hindostans live in *Hireland* among the *Papishes*, or in Scotland where they hun't nothin to eat, as I never seed one in *Hingland*. Besides our young mistresses gives, and why shouldnt we.' I stopped the torrent of *Mary's* eloquence—gave her a crown piece and dismissed her to the kitchen. How could I blame her for aping my wife and daughters? I found her threat concerning 'infidels' not a vain one. My wife let me into the secret. Every society had members whose duty it was to *watch* their neighbors. If any one expressed any doubts of the propriety of foreign missions he was forthwith to be branded as an 'infidel' and hunted down as such. In England you had beggars in rags—in America we have beggars in broadcloth. There is little difference between being *taxed* out of my money in England and being *begged* out of it in America. I have experienced both, and prefer the former. I shall dispose of my property and return to my native country, regretting only that I ever left it." I could not help thinking the Englishman's case a hard one. While in his native country he met the sneers of the High Church party as a puritan and dissenter—and here he was called an "infidel." I would ask the friends of the missionary cause if this prejudiced foreigner has made a true statement of his grievances? If his statement be true, how can they defend themselves against the charge of avarice and intolerance?

JOHN KNOX.

From a late account, the population of Europe, is estimated at 180,000,000. Of these, the number of Roman Catholics are 100,000,000; Protestants of different communities, 42,000,000; Greek Church, 32,000,000; Menonists, 240,000; Methodists, 180,000; Unitarians, 50,000; Quakers, 40,000; Mahometans, 2,630,000; Jews, 2,060,000; Herheters, 40,000.

He has gained every point, who mixes the useful with the agreeable.

He who makes two ears of corn grow, where only one grew before, deserves the thanks of his country.

Christian Philanthropist.

NEW-BEDFORD, DECEMBER 10, 1822.

"Things needful we have thought on; but the thing
Of all most needful—that which Scripture terms,
As if alone it merited regard,
The one thing needful—that's yet unconsidered."

THE time never has been when truth and virtue have been considered matters of real indifference. The ages that are gone by speak of them in a lofty language, to which, unless we shut the ear of our understanding with an obstinacy that brooks no reproof, and extinguish the kindling spark of virtue within us, it is impossible not to listen. Every hour pays a passing tribute to our characters in the actions and sentiments to which it gives birth, and every idea makes an impression on the heart, and adds a link to that chain of thought which will never end. Yet, and I know not why it is, the demeanor of the men of the present age offers to us a spectacle of selfishness that is truly sad to contemplate; of a selfishness truly despicable in its object, and which gives to the interests of wealth, of ambition, and of worldly grandeur an irresistible influence over them. Christianity, with her new order of virtues, has ceased to operate on the mind of man; philosophy has frowned sternly on the mad indulgence of those passions which degrade his character, and liberty, with all her high claims and splendid prerogatives, has struggled in vain to draw the soul to the happiness that is worthy of it, to the glory that it might attain to. Shall Virtue, shall Virtue then forever fly from our abodes? Shall man, the creature of God, never pursue, with firmness and success, that holy and brilliant career of greatness which was at first opened to his view? Shall he never learn to combat with vigour the strong temptations to which he is exposed? Shall he never be able to resist daringly the tyranny of those savage passions and evil habits which darken his understanding and poison his temper?—to disentangle his principles from the meshes of artifice and vanity which human villainy has cast about them—to cultivate those virtues which assimilate him to the good—and to beautify with generosity, justice, benevolence and the other graces, that earth which has been given him for an abode?

To be serious is no crime. Ask the libertine; even he will tell you so. There are times when his mind is impressed with sober sentiments. You will find him agitated at the remembrance of his vices. Ask him what man was made for, and he will tell you, that he was born only to be giddy and to be wretched. 'Tis false; he judges others by himself, and his standard is a false one. Yet there are times when the man of virtue ought to be serious, and there are times when he cannot change the current of his thoughts, or stop the train of his reflections, but he is sad in spite of himself—in spite of all his efforts to appear gay, and to be interested in the scenes in which others take delight around him. The present moment as it leaves him takes away a portion of that life which he loves, and draws a sigh from his bosom which flits away with it. The winter of the year disposes his mind to sadness. He gives it up, he knows not why, to the empire of melancholy ideas. He thinks of the close of life when the spirits of man are dull and his sense of pleasure is torpid, and when nothing is likely to sooth him but philosophy and virtue. As his mind becomes softened by external events, he perceives a pleasing melancholy stealing over him, and yields himself up to its influence without any attempt to control it. He then begins to think seriously, and to morosely about his conduct. No person can dis-

prove of the course which his thoughts are now taking. It is the course which every one who thinks prudently must certainly commend.

There is no period in the life of man when the absence of religious principle is more sensibly felt than at this very moment of sober reflection which I have just mentioned. There is no moment when the mind perceiving the want of something solid to rest upon, of some guide to direct its steps through the mazy paths of life, is more willing to place confidence in God and to ask strength of him who alone is able to impart it. It is the most proper, the most consolatory course. On this subject, I beg leave for a moment to dwell.—It is not my intention, like some modern philosophers, to prove why men on such occasions ought to be devout;—why, in fact, they should humble themselves, every day of their lives, in the presence of that great Being who has given them those immortal spirits which they have abused;—why they should adore that almighty Deity who has created the worlds, and that great sun, the eye of the world in which we live;—why they should hasten to mingle with that immense crowd of spirits who have left the earth, and who offer the incense of gratitude to him who makes them continually happy. All this, reason has often taught them, is the spontaneous offering of the grateful heart. It is not necessary to shew why they should ask knowledge of Him, who has created that understanding which perceives, pervades and penetrates;—why they should solicit protection from Him, who numbereth all the actions of their lives, and suffereth none of their thoughts to fall to the ground without his notice;—why they should intreat the compassion of Him, who permits and suffers the weaknesses that humble them only for their good. Conscience whispers to us that these things cannot be neglected without presumption. Nor is it requisite to prove, why they should beg mercy of Him, who died to expiate their crimes;—why they should ask and sue earnestly for those hallowed influences which kindle and ravish the soul, and make it feel for a time that it is not its own; why, in fine, standing in the presence of their Maker, they should carry their thoughts back to the past, and forward into the eternal ages, and consider wherefore it is, that they are made to resemble God. All this is not requisite, for every one who acknowledges the truth of the scriptures, knows that the duty of thanksgiving, of confession, of intreaty, is urged upon him with the greatest force by those writers who were anointed with the spirit;—every one, who is sensible of his own weakness, feels happy that superior power is ready to assist him when he is embarrassed; every one who knows how despicable and powerless are those idols of pleasure and ambition which the world worships, considers it a holy privilege, an ineffable honor to raise his thoughts to that King of kings, who has promised to make virtue a living principle within him.

Why then is this pleasing duty so much despised? On this point, I say, that evils of the life which are not yet eradicated; the pleasures of the world, to which the senses are sacrificed; its honors, which hold out to the selfish soul greater attractions than the service of virtue; an idea that frail, sinful man, whose life is a shadow, and whose faculties were given him to use, not to appropriate or to boast of, can do something holy without the assistance of his Maker, or perhaps that virtue itself is not worth so humiliating a surrender, are among the melancholy reasons which prevent the soul from holding that intercourse with God in which its perfection consists. Make, then, the tree good, and its fruit will be good also.

—
A woman's tongue is her sword, which she seldom suffers to rust.

Buonaparte's Opinion of Himself.

Napoleon Buonaparte, said Madame De Staél, was a man whose character exhibited itself entire in every action of his life. This is extravagant indeed. Perhaps the opinion he entertained of himself, especially of the innocence of his life, was equally wild. Our readers must judge. The following anecdotes are from the work entitled, "A Voice from St. Helena," published by his own physician. They are comprehensive enough. Those who wish to see more of them can consult the work, or the last Edinburgh Review, which contains an able article upon it.

"I never," said Napoleon, "committed a crime in all my political career. At my last hour, I can assert that. Had I done so, I should not have been here now. I should have despatched the Bourbons. It only rested with me to give my consent, and they would have ceased to live." I. 330—334.

The following is a more general defence of himself.

"While walking about the room, "What sort of a man did you take me to be, before you became my surgeon?" said he. "What did you think of my character, and what I was capable of? Give me your real opinion frankly." I replied, "I thought you to be a man whose stupendous talents were only to be equalled by your measureless ambition; and although I did not give credit to one-tenth part of the libels which I had read against you, still I believed that you would not hesitate to commit a crime when you found it to be necessary, or thought it might be useful to you." "This is just the answer that I expected," replied Napoleon, "and is perhaps the opinion of Lord Holland, and even of numbers of the French. I have risen to too great a pitch of human glory and elevation, not to have excited the envy and jealousy of mankind. They will say, "It is true, that he has raised himself to the highest pinnacle of glory; *mais pour y arriver, il commet beaucoup de crimes*, (but to attain it, he has committed many crimes.) Now the fact is, that I not only never committed any crimes, but I never even thought of doing so. *J'ai toujours marché avec l'opinion de grandes masses et les evenemens*, (I have always gone with the opinion of great masses, and with events.) I have always made *peu de cas* of the opinion of individuals; of that of the public a great deal. Of what use, then, would crime have been to me? I am too much a fatalist, and have always despised mankind too much, to have had recourse to crime to frustrate their attempts. *J'ai marché toujours avec l'opinion de cinq ou six millions d'hommes*, (I have always marched with the opinion of five or six millions of men;) of what use, then, would crime have been to me?"

"In spite of all the libels," continued he, "I have no fear whatever about my fame. Posterity will do me justice. The truth will be known; and the good which I have done, with the faults which I have committed, will be compared. I am not uneasy for the result. Had I succeeded, I should have died with the reputation of the greatest man that ever existed. As it is, although I have failed, I shall be considered as an extraordinary man: my elevation was unparalleled, because unaccompanied by crime. I have fought fifty pitched battles, almost all of which I have gained. I have framed and carried into effect a code of laws that will bear my name to the most distant posterity. From nothing, I raised myself to be the most powerful monarch in the world. Europe was at my feet. My ambition was great, I admit; but it was of a cold nature (*d'une nature froide*), and caused *par les evenemens* (by events,) and the opinion of great bodies. I have always been of opinion, that the sovereignty lay in the

people. In fact, the imperial government was a kind of republic. Called to the head of it by the voice of the nation, my maxim was *la carrière ouverte aux talents* (the career open to talents,) without distinction of birth or fortune; and this system of equality is the reason that your oligarchy hate me so much."

"If ever policy," continued he, "authorized a man to commit a crime and murder others, it authorized me to put to death Ferdinand, and the other Bourbons of his family when in France. Were I a man accustomed to commit crimes, would I not have effected one which it would have been so beneficial to me to put in execution? Ferdinand and his family once out of the way, the Spaniards would have had nothing to fight for, and would have submitted. No; had I been inclined to commit crimes, I should not be here. Would a French Bourbon be in existence now, had I consented to their murder? Not only did I refuse to consent, but I positively prohibited that any attempt of the kind should be made."

"It is not, added Napoleon, "by what the Quarterly Review, or Pichon says, or by what I could write myself, that posterity will judge of me; it is by the voice of so many millions of inhabitants who have been under my government."

"Those," continued he, "who consented to the union of Poland with Russia, will be the execration of posterity, while my name will be pronounced with respect, when the fine southern countries of Europe are a prey to the barbarians of the north. Perhaps my greatest fault was, not having deprived the King of Prussia of his throne, which I might easily have done. After Friedland, I ought to have taken Silesia and *** from Prussia, and given them to Saxony, as the king and the Prussians were too much humiliated, not to revenge themselves the first opportunity. Had I done this, given them a free constitution, and delivered the peasants from the feudal slavery, they would have been content." 1. 403—407.

The anecdote that follows is sufficiently enigmatic: he continues,

"To give you an instance of the general feeling in France towards the Bourbons, I will relate to you an anecdote. On my return from Italy, while my carriage was ascending the steep hill of Terare, I got out and walked up, without any attendants, as was often my custom. My wife and my suite were at a little distance behind me. I saw an old woman, lame, and hobbling about with the help of a crutch, endeavouring to ascend the mountain. I had a great coat on, and was not recognised. I went up to her and said, Well, *ma bonne*, where are you going with a haste which so little belongs to your years? What is the matter? "Ma foi," replied the old dame, "they tell me the Emperor is here, and I want to see him before I die." "Bah, bah," said I, "what do you want to see him for? What have you gained by him? He is a tyrant as well as the others. You have only changed one tyrant for another, Louis for Napoleon." "Mais Monsieur, that may be; but, after all, he is the king of the people, and the Bourbons were the kings of the nobles. We have chosen him, and if we are to have a tyrant, let him be one chosen by ourselves." "There," said he, "you have the sentiments of the French nation expressed by an old woman."

To believe the doctrines of the Gospel without examination, is a mark of weakness; to examine without believing, can only be the effect of obstinacy.

"Peveril of the Peak," by the author of Waverley, &c. is now in press at Philadelphia. Mr. Walsh has read a part, and says the hand of the master is visible in it.

POETRY.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN PHILANTHROPIST.

MIDNIGHT.

THE hour of midnight tolls—and all the world,
Deep sunk in joyous sleep, forget their cares.
Mine eye alone is wakeful, and mine ear
Rouses, to catch, perchance, some trifling sound—
The whistling of the night-breeze, as it creeps
Among the rustling leaves—the cricket's lonely
chirp,

As it rejoices on my warming hearth—
For, Silence, thou art dreadful! and thy reign
At this lone hour, warns me of the grave.
All—all is hush'd; and as I gaze around,
And, by the Moon-beam's misty lamp observe
Those places, which a few short hours ago were seen
Teeming with life, and thronged with anxious
Hearts, now noiseless as the dead—and each vain
Passion still'd, a voice from Heav'n seems whisp'ring
In my ear; "From this dread sleep of Nature learn
"Thy fate, and with it learn thy duties—thou hast
"Liv'd far from the objects of thy truest good,
"And sought from earth what Heav'n alone cangive;
"But thou wert made with soul immortal,
"A native of the skies; and all the joys and
"Troubles of this changing scene are but a
"Single sand-grain of the shore, weigh'd 'gainst
"The thoughts, the dangers and the hopes,
"That wait thee in Eternity." R.

To Mr. ——, commonly called the Rev. Mr. ——.

The undersigned, unitarian dissenters, present to you the following Protest against the marriage ceremony to which, according to the law of the land, they are compelled to subscribe. Against that ceremony, then, they most solemnly protest, because it makes marriage a religious instead of a civil act; because as Christians and Protestant dissenters, it is impossible we can allow of the interference of any human institution with matters which concern our faith and consciences; because, as knowing nothing of a priesthood in Christianity, the submission to a ceremony performed by a person in "holy orders," or pretended holy orders, is painful and humiliating to our feelings; because, as servants of Jesus Christ, we worship the one living and true God, his God and our God, his Father and our Father, and disbelieve and abominate the doctrine of the TRINITY, in whose name the marriage ceremony is performed.

(Signed,) WILLIAM COATES,
MARY-ANN THOMPSON,
Members of the Church of God, known by the
name of free thinking Christians.

London, June 10, 1814.

Soon after Sir William Johnson, superintendent of Indian affairs in America, had been appointed to the above place, he wrote to England for some suits of clothes, richly laced. When they arrived at Sir William's, Hendrick, king of the five nations of Mohawks, was present, and particularly admired them, but without saying any thing at that time to Sir William. In a few days Hendrick called on Sir William, and acquainted him that he had had a dream. On Sir William's enquiring what it was, he told him he had dreamed that he had given him one of those fine suits which he had lately received from "over the great waters." Sir William took the hint, and immediately presented him with one of the richest suits. Hendrick, highly pleased with the generosity of Sir William, retired. Sir William, some time after this, happening to be in company with Hendrick, told him that he also had a dream. Hendrick being very solicitous to know what it was, Sir William informed him

that he had dreamed that he (Hendrick) had made him a present of a particular tract of land (the most valuable on the Mohawk river) of about 5000 acres. Hendrick presented him with the land immediately, with this shrewd remark:

"Now, Sir William, I never will dream with you again, you dream too hard for me." The above tract of land is called now, Sir William's Dreaming Land.

MARRIED.

In Westport, by N. C. Brownell, Esq. Mr. Ichabod HANDY to Miss MARY M. WARREN, both of New-Bedford. By A. B. Gifford, Esq. Mr. ABNER THOMPSON, of Dartmouth, to Miss NANCY H. GIFFORD, of Westport.

In Chilmark, by the Rev. Mr. Smith, Mr. ROBERT ATHEARN, of Tisbury, to Miss ELIZA B. MAYHEW, of Chilmark.

In Tiverton, 1st inst. by the Rev. Mr. Peckham, Mr. PARDON BROWNELL, of Westport, to Miss ABIGAIL TABER, of Little-Compton.

DIED.

In this town, 4th inst. FRANCIS H. BLISS, aged 8 months, son of Mr. George Bliss.

In Troy, 26th ult. Mrs. Patience Slade, aged 52, widow of Jona. Slade, jun.

In Plymouth, Mr. Thomas Goodwin, aged 48, son of the late Gen. Goodwin.

Drowned, on the 26th ult. from on board sloop Mechanic, near Hurl Gate, Capt. JACOB AKIN, of Dartmouth, master and owner of said sloop—He was knocked overboard by the boom.

SHIP NEWS.

PORT OF NEW BEDFORD.

ARRIVED.

Dec. 4th—Brig Resolution, Dunbar, 64 days from Gottenburgh, with iron, to J. A. Parker.

5th—Sloops Eliza-Nicoll, Perry, New York; Bedford, Hitch, Boston.

6th—Sloops Harmony, Crowell, Albany; Butler, Gifford, New-York.

7th—Brig Protection, Delano, St. Ubes.

8th—Ship Sophia, Cathcart, from whaling; sloop Shepherdess, Wood, New York.

Entered, ship President, Fitzgerald, from Edgartown; sloop Mechanic, Killey, (late Akin) from New-York.

Cleared, ship Russell, Coleman, for Pacific Ocean, whaling; sloop Rockets, Studley, Richmond.

The members of the Dialectic Society are hereby informed that their first meeting for the present season will be held in the room appropriated to the New-Bedford Library, on Thursday evening next, at 7 o'clock.

DANIEL K. WHITAKER, Secy.

NOTICE.

THE Copartnership heretofore existing under the firm of TOBEY & BLACKBURN is this day by mutual consent dissolved. All persons indebted to said firm are requested to make immediate payment to JOHN C. BLACKBURN.

APOLLOS TOBEY.

JOHN C. BLACKBURN.

New-Bedford Nov. 22. 1822.

S. TOBEY, 2d, and J. C. BLACKBURN, inform their friends and the public, that they have formed a connection in business, under the firm of TOBEY & BLACKBURN, corner of Water and Center-streets, where they offer for sale a general assortment of Fall and Winter Goods.

Nov. 26.

TERMS OF THE PHILANTHROPIST:

Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, payable half yearly in advance.

All letters to the editor must be post paid